

*Note*.—In a short paper, containing notes on some species of *Chiroptera* collected by Mr. Theobald in Burma, published by me in the 'Proceedings' for August, 1872, I mentioned that I had obtained specimens of *Cynonycteris amplexicaudatus*, Geoff. from North-Western India.

I have since learned from Mr. W. T. Blanford, who sent me these specimens, that I have given a wrong locality for them, as they were taken by him in the Nemakdun Salt Caves, Kishnu Island, in the Persian Gulf.

The mistake in the locality, referred to above, was due to the label sent by Mr. Blanford having been misplaced after the receipt of the specimens.

In the Proceedings for December last I described a new species of *Vespertilio*, collected by Captain W. G. Murray in Kashmir, under the name of *V. macropus*. I discovered since, quite accidentally (as there is no copy of the "Mammals of Australia" in Calcutta,) that this name had been used for an Australian bat by Mr. Gould and consequently cannot be again employed. I propose, therefore, for this new species the name *Vespertilio longipes*.

## 2. On the Asiatic species of *Molossi*.—By G. E. DOBSON, B. A., M. B.

(Abstract.)

The paper commences with an account of the distribution of the species of this very remarkable and well defined group. The *Molossi* are divided into five genera, of which two only, *Nyctinomus* and *Chiromeles*, are found in the continent of Asia and its islands. By far the greater number of species belong to the genus *Molossus*, and are confined to the Western Hemisphere.

Two new species of *Nyctinomus* are described, one from Bengal and the Panjáb, *N. tragatus*, and one from China, *N. insignis*. The former resembles *N. plicatus*, Buch. Ham. very closely in size and in general aspect, but differs in possessing a much larger tragus, in the development of the ears, and in the place of attachment of the wing membrane; the latter, a large species, had been named by Mr. Blyth in his Catalogue of the Mammals in the Museum of the Asiatic Society, but not described.

The number of Asiatic species of *Molossi* described prior to 1873 were three, one *Chiromeles* and two *Nyctinomi*, and to these three more are added, making six the total number now known.

The paper will appear in the Journal.

## 3. On *Rhopalorhynchus Kröyeri*, a new genus and species of *Pycnogonida*.—By J. WOOD-MASON, ESQ.

The paper will appear in Journal Part II, No. 3, 1873.

## 4. Note regarding certain type specimens of *Batrachia* in the Asiatic Society's Museum.—By W. THEOBALD, ESQ.

The passage I wish to draw attention to in a paper of Dr. J. Anderson in the P. Z. S. of London for February, 1871, is the following: "It will be

observed that a number of Mr. Blyth's types of *Batrachia* in the Indian Museum have been identified. These are of peculiar interest, as Mr. Theobald was under the impression, when he drew up his Catalogue of the Reptiles in the Asiatic Society's Museum, that they had disappeared from the collection." On first being informed of this fact some time last year, I received the intimation with pleasure, thinking that I had been guilty of an oversight in the haste with which the Catalogue was compiled, but having recently had my attention re-drawn to the subject by Dr. J. E. Gray's repeated attacks on me, as regards the *Testudinata*, a full reply to which I am now preparing, I thought I would look into the "how and why" I came to overlook the above types, and the following is the result at which I have arrived, that whilst bearing full testimony to the patient research of Dr. Anderson, and the perfect fairness wherewith his remarks are written, I cannot but see there are some difficulties in the way of accepting his conclusion.

The first Batrachian type I was supposed to have overlooked, *Megalophrys gigas*, Blyth 71, is thus entered in Dr. Anderson's paper, and I cannot see how it is possible that Dr. Anderson can be right, but the facts are these.

"*RANA LIEBIGII*, Günther.

*Megalophrys gigas*, Blyth, Jour. As. Soc. Beng. XX p. 410, XIII p. 299, and XXIV p. 717.

*Rana Liebigii*, Gth. p. 38, 1860 p. 157 pt. 28, fig. A.

*Hylorana erythræa*, Schlegel, Theobald Cat. Rep. As. Soc. Museum p. 84 (J. A. S. XIII *supra* is a typographical error for XXIII)."

Now the object I had in view in preparing the Catalogue was quite distinct from the far more laborious one subsequently carried out by Dr. Anderson, namely, a critical examination of each individual specimen, and was mainly to record the number and names of specimens in the As. Soc. Museum at the time, as they stood recorded, recently in Mr. Blyth's own handwriting, on the labels attached to the bottles. As Mr. Blyth had described two species of *Megalophrys*, as among presentations to the Museum, I entered both species with references in the Catalogue, *but* as I could discover no specimens of the genus in the Museum, nor any specimens having that name on their label, I presumed that they had been lost. Doubtless what did take place, with respect to the species claimed as re-discovered by Dr. Anderson, was that Mr. Blyth, being satisfied it was no *Megalophrys*, removed the label. There is, however, a difficulty in accepting Dr. Anderson's identification which has not been explained or alluded to. As a matter of *fact*, the specimen which Dr. Anderson considers he has identified as the type of *Megalophrys Gigas*, was presented by Capt. W. S. Sherwill from Sikkim, and was an *adult male*; whilst the specimen identified as the above type under *Hylorana erythræa* in my Catalogue was labelled in Blyth's handwriting as presented by Major Berdmore from Mergui, and is moreover a

*large female* ! a fact corroborated by Dr. Anderson in re-examining the specimen. As stated by me the specimen was really labelled by Blyth *nigrovittatus*, which I have ranked as a synonym of *ERYTHREUS*, and was the type of that species.

The next species to which I would advert is *Diplopetma Berdmorei*, Blyth, which Dr. Anderson charges me with confounding with *D. pulchrum*, Gth. Now *Dip. Berdmorei* is one of the commonest and best marked frogs in Pegu, and I am perfectly familiar with it ; yet Dr. Anderson had full warrant for what he said, for by a ridiculous typographical blunder *Dip. Berdmorei* is printed in italics, as though a synonym of the preceding species, the name of which, being an Indian frog is entered by me according to my plan, though no specimens were in the Museum. Though Dr. Anderson was really mistaken in this matter, he was fully justified in what he said so far, but I am not convinced that his recognition of the types said to be missing is correct. *Dip. Berdmorei* is subject to very little variation in colour or size, and it is more likely than not, that among four specimens from any part of Burmah he could find one which "accurately agrees with Blyth's measurements." As a matter of fact, however, the 4 bleached specimens catalogued by me, were labelled as presented by Col. Phayre from Arakan, whilst the type of "*Engystoma Berdmorei*, J. A. S. XXIV p. 720, was presented by Capt. Berdmore from Schwe Gyen. I cannot therefore hold that the authority of an original label can be superseded on the grounds of an accidental agreement or measurement in a frog subject to such slight variation as that in question. I am not aware if I am supposed to have overlooked any other types than the above, which it appears in the last degree questionable if I really did overlook, but I merely bring forward the subject in order that so curious an error of so accurate an observer as Dr. Anderson should not be perpetuated, to the bewilderment of whoever may hereafter desire to examine Mr. Blyth's types.

Dr. Stoliczka regretted that Dr. Anderson was not present to explain the mistake complained of by Mr. Theobald. He said that though he had in this case little doubt about the correctness of Dr. Anderson's specific identifications, still a mistake about Blyth's typical specimens might have occurred, unless specimens from different localities, but belonging to the same species, had been put together in the same bottle with the type specimens. In such cases one could really do no more than select that specimen as the type, which precisely agreed with the original description.

5. *A Contribution towards a Monograph of the Passalulæ.*—By DR. F. STOLICZKA.

(Abstract.)

The author said that his object in examining the Indian representatives of this family was chiefly to test the views expressed by Dr. Kaup